UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,391	11/09/2001	Sheng-Shing Li	PP/1-22278/P5/CGC 2069	2361
Patent Departm	7590 10/19/200 ent	EXAMINER		
Ciba Specialty	Chemicals Corporation	CHOI, PETER Y		
540 White Plains Road P.O. Box 2005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Tarrytown, NY	10591-9005	1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/19/2007	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/045,391	LI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Peter Y. Choi	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 October 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidated (with appeal fee) in compliance	of Appeal. To avoid abai avit, or other evidence, v se with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mai b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN T	ling date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(: Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR tension and the corresponding amous hortened statutory period for reply out than three months after the mailing of the status of the st	nt of the fee. The appropri- riginally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was a property or the Notice of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS		6 ''' 41 4 11	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see N w);	OTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially	reducing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a on NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally r	ejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		Compliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		e, timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		will be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,7-12,17-19</u> , <u>and 25</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been conside because:  See Continuation Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the app	olication in condition for a	allowance
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	-	
/Peter Y. Choi/		/Andrew T Dizieli/	
Examiner, Art Unit 1794		/Andrew T Piziali/ Primary Examiner, Art	Unit 1794

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that Mor and Patel are aimed at disparate arts and are not properly combined. However, as set forth in the Final Rejection of August 1, 2007, Mor teaches that fibers are the main constituents of fabrics and nonwovens (Mor, column 1 lines 40-42). Patel describes throughout the increased softness and smoothness of fabrics to which the composition of Patel has been applied (Patel, column 13 lines 45-55, column 16 lines 29-44). Therefore, Mor and Patel are in the same or similar arts and are properly combined. Additionally, see Examiner's remarks in the aforesaid Final Rejection, section 3. Moreover, Applicants have not set forth arguments or evidence as to why the the Mor and Patel references are not properly combinable or obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Applicants argue that one of ordinary skill in the art could not have arrived at the present invention from the combined disclosure of Mor and Patel. However, as set forth in the aforesaid Final Rejection, Patel teaches the use of UNILIN 425 and derivatives of UNILIN, and Petrolite Specialty Polymers Group teaches that a derivative of UNILIN 425 ethoxylate may contain 10-80% of ethylene oxide to form the ethoxylate alcohol consisting of 1, 2, or 4 monomers of ethoxy groups. Patel teaches that the ethoxy groups may comprise up to about 20 ethoxy groups per mole. A derivative of UNILIN 425 appears to anticipate the claimed chemical composition and Applicants have not submitted evidence that a derivative of UNILIN 425 would not anticipate the claimed chemical composition. Applicants argue that the present invention provides unexpected wettability results. However, Applicants are not claiming wettability results, nor are Applicants specifically claiming the known compound UNITHOX 420, for which Applicants argue that such wettability results and Liquid Absorption Capacity in combination with a polyolefin are believed attained.